DEFRANK

Serial No.: 10/003,509 Attorney Docket No.: 100110598-1

## REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated September 9, 2005 contained a final rejection of claims 1-50. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41. Claims 1-50 are in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,410) in view of Brouk et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0053459).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the current amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicants' claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41 now include in part determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the errors messages and listing the required missing fonts and graphically indicating the missing fonts related to the error messages. As described in paragraphs [0026] and [0027] of the Applicants' disclosure, the "...service verifies that the particular PDF file has all the correct and necessary font files, step 220. A determination is made in regards to whether the PDF file includes all the font files, step 225. If the particular PDF file has all the necessary and required font files, the application is informed, step 230. A user interface screen instructs the user that the task has been performed and asks the user to exit the application, step 235. If required font files are not included in the PDF file, the service informs the application the PDF file or files are missing and lists the particular required missing font files, step 240. The application builds a user interface screen with, the user interface screen indicating the missing font files, step 245. User is instructed to select to upload the missing font files, step 250. The application receives the missing font files and adds them to the existing PDF file, step 255. The process goes back to step 215 and continues process from there." (see U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030061357).

In contrast, Kikinis in combination with Brouk et al. simply disclose "...a session script between hand-held computer 13, Proxy-Server 19, and any WEB server 23...and...the NanoBrowser incorporated in computer unit 13, and the InterBrowser,

Serial No.: 10/003,509 Attorney Docket No.: 100110598-1

incorporated in Proxy-Server 19..." (see col. 9, lines 65-67 through col. 10, lines 1-10 and FIGS. 3-4 of Kikinis) and a system "...for enabling the interchange of enterprise data through an open platform...based on a standardized interface that enables parties to easily connect to and use the network." (see Abstract of Brouk et al.). Although the combination includes a working interface (Kikinis) and the sending of error response messages (Brouk et al.), the combination is still missing the Applicants' claimed determining whether the remote application is missing required fonts related to the errors messages and listing the required missing fonts and graphically indicating the missing fonts related to the error messages.

This failure of the combined cited references to <u>disclose</u>, <u>suggest or provide</u> <u>motivation</u> for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness. <u>W.L. Gore& Assocs. V. Garlock, Inc.</u>, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). <u>In re Gordon</u>, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the combined cited references cannot render the Applicant's invention obvious.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly <u>request</u> the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted, Dated: December 9, 2005

Edmond A. DeFrank

Reg. No. 37,814

Attorney for Applicants

(818) 885-1575 TEL

(818) 885-5750 FAX